

CI 1873 S Wynter

First name: Shannon

Last name: Wynter

Q1:

I'm of the opinion that the existing framework may be so far out of date with current technologies and social expectations that it might just be better to start from scratch on a new framework.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to make it easier for parents to identify content that they might not consider as suitable for their children to have access to. It should not be used to prevent consenting adults from accessing the content they want to.

Q3:

Yes and no, one has to understand that a medium like TV and Radio are planned and regional so can easily be time slotted, a medium like the internet on the other hand is without time, and usually completely unplanned - the content on the internet is changing constantly - a typical forum might have to be re-classified a million times per day as the content changes.

Q4:

I'd question the content and intent of the complaint, it's been shown recently that one single individual or a co-ordinates group of people working as one can achieve censorship over the rest of the population. Again, in online applications this is rather impractical as the content can change very rapidly in real time.

Q5:

Yes, if it's targeted for children then it should at the very least meet some basic guidelines as to what is appropriate for children to be accessing.

Q6:

No

Q7:

Classified, yes - restricting, no. Classify the artwork, inform the potential consumer what to expect to see when viewing the artwork but leave it up to the consumer to decide to view it or walk away

Q8:

Again yes and no, music could be classified with warnings on content but it should in no way be restricted or regulated - there are radio stations out there that play music and content for families avoiding more controversial songs for their listening pleasure.

Q9:

No, classify everything with clear universal language (eg. "offensive language") so the audience can make informed decisions.

Q10:

As long as you're talking classification not censorship/restriction - then no, all content should be classified - the idea of classification is to make it possible to make informed decisions about the content before subjecting oneself to the content

Q11:

Q12:

Do not even try, inform people how they might control their own household's access to restricted content - at a national level such an idea is impractical - you cannot restrict access to anything in a way that would not be trivially bypassed.

Q13:

Better education for parents, there are ISPs out there that exist only to create a safer online environment for parents. Parents can create whitelist browsing environments for their children. Hardware devices can be installed to control access to sites, blocking the trivial methods of bypassing (which otherwise have plenty of legitimate use - making such systems invasive and impractical on a national level)

Q14:

Honestly, what male has gone from age 10 to age 20 without getting their hands on a girly mag/playboy/etc - I suspect the current methods are sufficient. After all if not for an explicit magazine they only have to look as far as a target/kmart catalog.

Q15:

Before sale (on the cover) and again before the content is view able/accessed.

Q16:

Informational.

Q17:

Possibly yes, the industry involved knows it's self and it's consumers better.

Q18:

Q19:

Tough one, anything free or not for profit should be fully subsidised - small independent producers should be partially subsidised.

Q20:

Q21:

I'm honestly not sure what categories there are - but I know they're not consistent across medium - Gaming for example is in desperate need of an 18+ category so that games that are horribly unsuitable for teens and young adults aren't tweaked to fit the 15+ category.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Wow, what an open ended question - policing anything online is difficult - prohibiting (actively preventing access) is not going to be possible - yes china does it, but only because you risk jail or execution for bypassing their restrictions.

No.

People say child porn - but the way the government thinks about "online" usually starts with www and ends in .html - realistically there's very little child porn in this domain, and in 15 years of browsing I've never accidentally found anything that could be considered such.

Same goes for regular garden variety porn, I've never accidentally stumbled upon it, usually when one "finds" this stuff they're either looking for it or they're already in a shady neighborhood.

Q25:

Just because the classifiers refuse to classify it, why should the public be required to pretend it doesn't exist? RC content is not immediately illegal.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

I have to note that a lot of these questions read to censorship - I'm opposed to government/national level censorship.

Classification is a tool meant to make it easy to identify potentially offending or disturbing content. So that adults can make informed decisions about what they want to consume as entertainment, and so that parents can chose appropriate content for their children.

I find it disturbing how much violence we let into our lives through media and content and no-one seems to bat an eyelid. Showing a breast is 'bad' borderline 'evil' slapped with a 18+ sticker but I can watch people getting disemboweled at 15+?